UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/511,428 | 06/28/2005 | Norbert Grass | 32860-000802/US | 2402 |

30596 7590 06/25/2007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O.BOX 8910
RESTON, VA 20195

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| KIANNI, KAVEH C | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2883 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 06/25/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/511,428 | GRASS, NORBERT | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kianni C. Kaveh | 2883 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 October 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

## Specification and Claim Objections

Specification and claims 7 and 15-16 are objected to because of the following informalities: The limitation/acronym PCF is not defined. Appropriate correction is required.

### Drawings

The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the electrical filter(s) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112*

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

claim 1 is ambiguous, since in one hand claim 1 and subsequent claims 2-18, in preambles, state that there is a high-voltage device for 'an electric filters', while in the next two lines, lacking an antecedent basis, by stating 'the electric filter'; on the other hand, in the application units 1 as both high-voltage device(s) as well as electric filter(s) (see 0022) and it is difficult to concisely draw relationship between these limitations. Appropriate correction(s) is/are required.

Claim 9 states protocols 'in the like' and/or 'such as' that make the claim ambiguous as not being concisely defined. Appropriate correction(s) is/are required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combination of Reihard et al. (DE 3711244 A1) and Williams (US 5990687).

Reinhard teaches a high-voltage supply device for electric units (see abstract and fig. 1), comprising:

high-voltage devices, arranged close to the electric unit, adapted to supply the electric unit with an electrical high voltage (see at least abstract and fig. 1); measuring heads, associated with the high-voltage devices, adapted to detect and transmit at least one of measured values and, diagnosis data from the high-voltage devices; and control units, each respectively associated with a high-voltage device, each adapted to control and regulate the associated high-voltage devices depending on requirements and taking into consideration the at least one of measured values and diagnosis data detected by the measuring heads, wherein the measuring heads, on the high-voltage device side, each include an optical waveguide interface, wherein the measuring heads, on the high-voltage device side, are connected via their optical waveguide interfaces in a first local optical waveguide network, wherein the control units are connected to one another by a second local optical waveguide network, and wherein the local optical waveguide network, on the high-voltage device side, and the local optical waveguide network, on the control unit side, are coupled to one another by an optical waveguide connection (see abstract, fig. 1 and page 1, col. 1 –2); wherein at least one of the local optical waveguide network on the high-voltage device side, and the local optical waveguide network on the control unit side, includes a ring topology

(page 1, col. 2, last parag.); wherein at least one of the local optical waveguide network on the high-voltage device side, and/or the local optical waveguide network on the control unit side, includes a star topology (see fig. 1); wherein at least one of a ring and star topology, forming the local optical waveguide networks, is of redundant design (see fig. 1); wherein the optical waveguides of the local optical waveguide networks are plastic optical waveguides (see fig. 1, wherein plastic optical waveguides/fibers are conventional and the examiner takes official notice); wherein the optical waveguide connection between the two local optical waveguide networks is of redundant design (see fig. 1); wherein the optical waveguides of the optical waveguide/prefabricated connection are in the form of at least one of glass and PCF optical waveguides/ CUPOFLEX+ cable (see fig. 1, wherein such optical waveguides/fibers are conventional and the examiner takes official notice); wherein the optical waveguide connection is in the form of a sheathed optical waveguide cable (see fig. 1); wherein standard protocols, for example CAN, PROFIBUS, TCPIP protocols or the like, may be used as the transmission protocol between the measuring heads and the control units (such protocols are extremely conventional and the examiner takes official notice); wherein the ring topology, forming the local optical waveguide networks, is of redundant design (see fig. 1, redundant optical fibers); wherein the optical waveguide connection between the two local optical waveguide networks is of redundant design (see fig. 1); wherein the optical waveguide connection between the two local optical waveguide networks is of redundant design (see fig.1).

However, Reinhard does not specifically/explicitly state that the above electric units are electric filters. Though it may be argued that such electric units are or used analogously as that of applicant and amounts to such limitation nonetheless, such limitation more specifically taught by Williams (see at least col. 14, line 43-col. 15, 1st parg.). Thus, Williams provide means insight in identifying and repairing failures (see col. 1, 1st parg.). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art when the invention was made to combine the teachings of Williams to that Reinhard to produce an high-voltage device that include the above limitations since such combinational teaching would provide efficient supply lines for consumers (see abstract).

### *Citation of Relevant Prior Art*

Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. In accordance with MPEP 707.05 the following references are pertinent in rejection of this application since they provide substantially the same information disclosure as this patent does. These references are:
(US-20020030869 or US-20010006469 US-5990687 or US-6282106 EP-569838 or DE-3711244)

These references are cited herein to show the relevance of the apparatus/methods taught within these references as prior art.

### *Contact Information*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kianni C. Kaveh whose telephone number is 571-272-2417. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-19:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank Font can be reached on 571-272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 15, 2007

K. CYRUS KIANNI
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER